



Bay Area Dioxins Project



Association of Bay Area
Governments

Summary of Discussions TASK FORCE MEETING SEPTEMBER 12, 2001

Attending the meeting were:

Jennifer Krebs, ABAG Staff*

Kelly Moran, TDC Environmental+

Michell Buzbee, LWA+

Michael Kent, Contra Costa County Health Services

Eric Zell, Zell and Associates

Craig Johns, Partnership for Sound Science in Public Policy

John Crouch, Hearth Products Association

Mike Green, Center for Environmental Health +

Katie Silberman, Center for Environmental Health +

Julie Weiss, City of Palo Alto*

Niko Letunic, City of Oakland*

Andrew Clark-Clough, City of Oakland*

Mark Westlund, City and County of San Francisco

Pamela Evans, Alameda County*

Michael Smith, ABAG Staff*

(+ task force consultant, * task force member)

Welcome/Introductions

Jennifer Krebs convened the meeting and welcomed task force members and the public.

Public Comment Period - Speakers

- John Crouch, Hearth Products Association

Update on Public Outreach Efforts/Process

Katie Silberman and Mike Green of Center for Environmental Health gave an overview of public participation in the Bay Area Dioxins Project in relation to the development of the screening evaluation report (Attachment 1). They gave a brief summary of the individuals and groups involved in mailouts for meeting notifications. It was also noted that all public comments presented at meetings or submitted by mail/fax/e-mail were disseminated to the task force for use in their evaluation of pollution prevention projects and finalization of the screening evaluation report.

Update on Revisions to Screening Evaluation

Kelly Moran gave a presentation on the editing process of the screening evaluation report. Kelly stated that 46 references had been added to the report as a result of public comments submitted to the task force. Besides the references, Kelly grouped the public comments into general categories and responded to them by adding Appendix C to the report as a FAQ. Kelly also stated that the report was not a regulatory or decision-making document but an informational document to be used by the members of the task force in developing their own pollution prevention projects.

Julie Weiss and Mark Westlund presented a motion to accept the report. The Dioxins Task Force accepted the screening evaluation report without comment.

Kelly asked Jennifer Krebs to clarify the role the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) has in the Dioxins Project. Jennifer responded by stating that ABAG's role in the process is as a coordinator to

facilitate discussion and meetings. Final decisions on adopted projects will be made by local jurisdictions. ABAG will not recommend or select pollution prevention (P2) projects.

P2 Project Selection

Michelle Buzbee then gave a brief presentation on the basics of setting up an effective P2 project (Attachments 2 and 3). Larry Walker Associates did an extensive search on literature related to behavioral change related to pollution prevention and presented a case study from King County, Washington as an example. The case study showed the importance of working with a small, targeted group. Small groups are easier to work with because of the level of communication that is possible between project proponents and those interested in participating in the project. She noted that this is the reason that businesses are often the first group targeted for new projects. Once results are obtained by working with a small group, it can serve as an example when involving the public in general.

Kelly added to Michelle's presentation by stating that projects have nothing to do with pollution prevention until there is implementation. Small groups are better to work with because there is more direct interaction with project participants and proponents are able to receive higher quality feedback as they refine the project. The King County case study was able to expand their project because of the core participation of the targeted group.

Kelly Moran then began a discussion about assigning budget priorities for consultants in providing technical assistance to jurisdictions on P2 projects (Attachments 4 and 5). By default, assigning budget priorities also assigns priority to the projects. Kelly noted that the paper and PVC purchasing options had been combined into one project because of the similarities in targeted groups and processes. She also presented a new project option for diesel engines that was the result of task force comments from the July meeting.

The three projects up for task force consideration are: medical waste management, preferred purchasing for paper and PVC alternatives, and diesel fuel alternatives. Mark Westlund asked if PVC alternatives would include green building projects. Kelly responded that it is up to the individual jurisdictions to determine the scope of their projects. Niko Letunic asked if an alternative products purchasing fair would be for participating jurisdictions only or would the public be invited as well. Kelly responded that this is also up to the jurisdictions. Julie Weiss noted that a preferred purchasing project provided opportunities for cooperation among participants. Kelly stated that the technical consultants would do project and guideline research to provide further information and assistance to participating jurisdictions.

A question was raised by a member of the public as to whether all Bay Area jurisdictions would need to participate or just those who are involved in the task force. Jennifer responded that they do not know at this point because the issue has not been addressed.

Kelly moved on to medical waste management. The technical consultants will develop Bay Area specific waste management alternatives. Niko asked if hospitals in other states were sending medical waste to Oakland for incineration. Andrew Clark-Clough responded that Hawaii sends their medical waste to Oakland. Niko would also prefer that the consultants develop state specific alternatives as opposed to Bay Area specific alternatives. Pam Evans said the Department of Health Services already has a project and it would be good to build on existing efforts. Julie concurred stating that other groups are working on this issue and interest is out there.

Jennifer asked if there were any new projects that the task force would like added to the list. There were no additions suggested by the task force. After Niko raised the question as to whether a diesel project was duplicative of efforts by the Bay Area Air Quality Management District, Pam and Julie stated that they wanted to keep all three projects. Niko, Mark, and Andrew concurred with Pam and Julie and the participating jurisdictions found the proposed project budget acceptable as a starting point.

The technical consultants said that they would be able to draft project work plans by the October meeting date.

Budget update

Jennifer stated that there were no changes to the budget since the July meeting.

Public Comment Period - Speakers

- Craig Johns, Partnership for Sound Science in Public Policy
- Eric Zell, Zell & Associates

Adjournment

Next meeting October 16, 10am ABAG Office, Conference Room B

Public Participation in the Association of Bay Area Governments Bay Area Dioxins Project

Public participation is integral to the success of the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG) Bay Area Dioxins Project. The Project has seen a robust public turnout for everything from informal informational meetings to submitted written comment.

Public Participation in the Project has proceeded in three stages: first, outreach to interested parties; second, receiving comments from members of the public; and third, incorporating those comments into the decisionmaking of the Project. Bay Area Dioxins Project Task Force members - representing Bay Area municipalities - take public comment very seriously, and have incorporated many suggestions from the public into Project decisionmaking.

Following is a breakdown of how public comments were solicited, received, and incorporated into the Project. Questions about the process may be directed to Jennifer Krebs at ABAG (510/ 464-7977), or public participation facilitators Michael Green and Katie Silberman (510/ 594-9864).

Stage One: Outreach

(autumn 2000 - spring 2001)

- Outreach to interested parties, including mailing more than 800 informational brochures to educate the public about the Project
- Input from public about how the public participation process should proceed
- Informational meetings between Task Force members, members of the public, project technical consultant, and public participation facilitators

Stage Two: Receipt of Public Comment (spring 2001)

- Draft document, Screening Evaluation of Dioxins Pollution Prevention options, available for review. Review period lasts from mid-January to end of April, 2001.
- April 26, 2001 Public meeting - more than 30 members of the public attended, eighteen spoken comments received
- Receipt of 33 written comments from interested stakeholders

Stage Three: Incorporating Public Comment into the Project (summer 2001- present)

- All public comments (written and spoken) distributed to all municipalities participating on the Task Force.
- Comments divided into three categories:
 1. Comments about the Draft document: Screening Evaluation of Dioxins Pollution Prevention Options, prepared by Project consultant TDC Environmental
 2. Comments about selection of pilot projects by the Task Force
 3. Comments on the public participation process and/or the Bay Area Dioxins Project itself.
- Each category of comments was integrated into the Project to the fullest extent feasible:
 1. Comments about the draft document were reviewed and discussed thoroughly by Task Force members, and integrated into the document wherever feasible. Frequently asked questions were addressed in a new section at the end of the document. Changes to the document were made by TDC Environmental, under the direction of Task Force members.
 2. Comments about the selection of pilot projects were summarized and provided to all Task Force members. Task

Force members thoroughly discussed public comments and incorporated public comments into decisionmaking at the July 16, 2001 Task Force meeting.

3. Comments on the public participation process and/or the Bay Area Dioxins Project were extensively discussed by Task Force members, and have resulted in several changes to Project procedure. In response to public requests, Task Force meetings are now open to the public and include two public comment periods; and meeting schedules, agendas and minutes are posted to the Project web site (<http://dioxin.abag.ca.gov>).

Task Force members appreciate all comments submitted, and wish to thank every member of the public who has taken time to submit comments. Task Force meetings will remain open to the public, and all interested parties are invited to participate in the two public comment periods per meeting for the life of the Project.

Attachment 2

Effective Pollution Prevention Programs

Developing An Effective Pollution Prevention Project

- Learn about your audience
- Address barriers to changing behavior

Behavior Change Principles

- Providing information is not enough
- Changing attitudes may not change behavior
- Incentives may change short term but not long term behavior
- Getting involved is the first step in making a commitment to change
- Feedback and follow-up are important
- Credible sources, change agents and role models are important

Where do People Get Information?

Source	Stormwater Issues	Other Local Issues
Network television	49%	63%
Newspaper	47%	65%
Radio	5%	24%
Cable television	4%	15%
Magazines	3%	12%
Billboards	3%	5%
Storm drain stenciling	3%	
Brochures	1%	6%
School Programs	1%	4%
Other	8%	4%
Don't know	6%	0

Source: Los Angeles County Department of Public Works

Dentists get information about environmental issues from

Local Dental Society	78%
California Dental Society	73%
Seminars	55%
Journals	49%
American Dental Association	44%
Brochures	38%
Government Agencies	33%
Other	6%

Attachment 3

Participation Factors

Control Strategy	Audience	Participation Rate	Budget
Outreach to encourage education of customers regarding harmful effects of Lindane – Pilot project including press releases, radio and TV spots, collateral material to medical offices, phone surveys	33 Pharmacists	90%	\$160,000
Outreach to discourage use of prescription Lindane – Pilot project including press releases, radio and TV spots, collateral material to medical offices, phone surveys	500 Health Care Professionals	43%	\$160,000
Outreach to encourage recycling of scrap amalgam – Brochure w/ recommended practices, Work with dental society, Correspondence, Site visits	843 Dentists	75%	\$75,000
Outreach to encourage recycling of other amalgam wastes – Brochure w/ recommended practices, Work with dental society, Correspondence, Site visits	843 Dentists	15-30%	\$75,000
Mailed survey response rates – 2 page survey w/ pre-addressed stamped envelopes	843 Dentists	20-25%	\$10,000
Workshop attendance – letters and phone contacts to encourage people to attend informational workshop	Building community (1000 builders)	5%	\$27,000
Outreach to encourage turn in of mercury thermometers: Media events, press coverage, radio and TV spots – 1 month long campaign in San Francisco	General Public (335,000 households)	1%	\$75,000
Mailed survey response rates - 2 page survey (including questions about pesticides) w/ pre-addressed stamped envelopes	General public (50,000 residents)	40%	\$8,000
Awareness of pesticide education program Multiyear campaign with newspaper coverage, movie theatre slides, local signage, pest management guide, workshops	General public (50,000 residents)	50%	\$50,000 per year
Behavior change to use less pesticides – Multiyear campaign with newspaper coverage, movie theatre slides, local signage, pest management guide, workshops	General Public (50,000 residents)	4-17%	\$50,000 per year
Outreach to increase awareness of difference between stormwater and wastewater – multi-year effort with signage, newspaper coverage, brochures	General Public (50,000 residents)	50%	\$50,000 per year

Source: *Tools to Measure Source Control Program Effectiveness, Phase 2 Final Report*. Prepared by Larry Walker Associates for WERF. July 16, 2001.

Attachment 4

Diesel Engine Project Option

Purpose: Produce information to assist municipalities in pursuing projects to reduce dioxin emissions from diesel engines.

Background: Dioxins are present in diesel fuel as well as in diesel exhaust. Although the conclusion is disputed, BAAQMD says that diesel emissions are a major regional dioxins source. Diesel engines power heavy-duty equipment like trucks, railroad engines, and generators. Such engines have long lifetimes and relatively low maintenance needs. Most heavy-duty vehicles in agency fleets are diesel fueled, including construction and maintenance equipment, street sweepers, buses, garbage trucks, and fire engines.

Opportunities to reduce dioxin emissions from diesel engines include replacing diesel engines with natural gas engines, using biodiesel or oxydiesel as a substitute for diesel fuels in existing diesel engines, retrofitting existing diesel engines to reduce particulate formation during engine operation, and reducing the number of trips and/or changing certain practices (idling, heavy acceleration) made in diesel vehicles.

The potential scope of a diesel project is quite large. However, many of the sources are engines in equipment owned by private companies (private trucking companies/ railroad/construction companies). An ideal project might be a pilot project that targets county/city vehicles. One benefit to a diesel engine project would be that the dioxin emission reductions would be local.

Summary of Public Comments on a Diesel Engine Project:

Pro	Con	Comment	Commenter
X		Supports a diesel engine project that consists of encouraging studies of dioxins emissions from "clean diesel" buses, developing an interagency work group with transit districts on the implementation of "clean diesel" and progress to zero emissions buses, and recommend demonstration projects to advance alternative fuels technologies, including electricity, CNG, "clean diesel," fuel cells, and biodiesel without creating risks to general funds or the public health.	Western States Petroleum Association, Dennis Bolt
X		Supports a diesel vehicle alternatives project	Arnold, Jan
	X	Oppose diesel vehicle project involving replacing municipal diesel vehicles with CNG	Western States Petroleum Association, Dennis Bolt

Scope: Based on feedback from municipalities, a small effort in this area is proposed. Two small exploratory project options are described, aimed at helping municipalities get started in pursuing potential diesel fuel alternative pollution prevention projects. Options include:

- Exploring grant and other funding opportunities to allow municipalities to conduct one of the following pilot/demonstration projects:
 - Switch from diesel to biodiesel or oxydiesel.
 - Retrofit existing diesel engines.
 - Replace diesel engines with natural-gas powered engines.
 - Reduce use of diesel vehicles and switch to other methods of transferring goods and people (e.g. rail). Promote driving practices to reduce idling time and avoid heavy acceleration.
- Develop information to publicize current diesel fuel alternative projects in Berkeley, San Francisco International Airport, and Palo Alto.

Potential barriers and issues:

- The proposed projects do not in themselves implement pollution prevention, but they facilitate the implementation of potential future projects.

Products: Grant application list or case study text.

Schedule: *[Depends on selected project elements- need to discuss and develop]*

Budget: \$5000 for a basic project as described above; up to \$10,000.

Implementing Municipality(ies): *[To be determined- Departments potentially involved within interested jurisdiction or agency include: vehicle fleet, transit fleet, street maintenance fleet, fire department, solid waste collection fleet, purchasing.]*

Attachment 5

Information for P2 Project Selection

Project	Description	Consultant Budget
Medical Waste Management	The purpose of this project is to reduce medical waste sent by hospitals to incineration. Consultant to develop Bay Area-specific information on medical waste management alternatives. Consultant to arrange/conduct event to train local government staff regarding alternatives. Consultant to support local government contacts with hospitals. Project would involve close cooperation with and partnering with Health Care P2 project participants.	\$20,000
Preferred Purchasing for Paper and PVC Alternatives	The purpose of this project is to assist municipal staff with purchasing PCF paper and PVC alternatives. The project would also involve development of specific information on alternatives that could be distributed to others. Consultant to explore setting up a purchasing pool for municipalities to purchase PCF paper. Consultant to assemble a package of background information and purchasing policies. Consultant to arrange a vendor fair. Consultant to obtain information and assist municipal staff with purchasing PVC alternatives.	\$25,000
Diesel Fuel Alternatives	The purpose of this project is to provide municipalities with information that could be used to develop a diesel fuel alternative demonstration project. Consultant to develop a basic information package regarding grant opportunities or diesel fuel alternative projects being conducted by Berkeley, Palo Alto and San Francisco International Airport. Creating a more graphically attractive product would cost more.	\$5,000
Total		\$50,000

\$50,000 is currently available to conduct pollution prevention projects. The projects listed above were selected based on information provided by the cities/ municipalities on project interests at the July 16th meeting. These are brief descriptions of what the consultant team can do for the amounts listed. The scope of each project can be adjusted based on the interests and interests of the municipalities. Once final projects are selected the consultant team will provide detailed work plans to the cities/ municipalities for review.